Case 3305

TUBIFICIDAE Vejdovský, 1876 (Annelida, Clitellata): proposed precedence over NAIDIDAE Ehrenberg, 1828

Christer Erséus

Department of Zoology, Göteborg University, Box 463, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden (e-mail: christer.erseus@zool.gu.se)

Lena Gustavsson

Department of Invertebrate Zoology, Swedish Museum of Natural History, Box 50007, SE-104 05 Stockholm, Sweden (e-mail: lena.gustavsson@nrm.se)

Ralph O. Brinkhurst

3570 Cainsville Rd, Lebanon, TN 37090, U.S.A. (e-mail: oligo1@aol.com)

Abstract. The purpose of this application, under Article 23.9.3 of the Code, is to conserve the usage of the family-group name TUBIFICIDAE Vejdovský, 1876 for a well known group of aquatic oligochaetous clitellates. Following recent molecular studies it has been concluded that NAIDIDAE Ehrenberg, 1828 is a phylogenetic member of the taxon previously referred to as TUBIFICIDAE, implying that these two names are synonyms. Both names have long been used by aquatic biologists as associated with two functionally separated groups of worms. The junior name TUBIFICIDAE, with the famous *Tubifex* worm as its type, has been used for about 800 benthic species, which are burrowing or living interstitially in various limnic and marine sediments. The senior name NAIDIDAE, on the other hand, has been referred to about 175 species, most of which are epibenthic or epiphytic in freshwater habitats. It is proposed that the family-group name TUBIFICIDAE be given precedence over NAIDIDAE.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Annelida; Oligochaeta; Clitellata; NAIDIDAE; TUBIFICIDAE; *Nais*; *Tubifex*; sludge worms.

^{1.} Müller (1774, p. 20) established the generic name *Nais* for several species, including *Nais barbata* Müller, 1774 (p. 23), which was selected as the type by Sperber (1948, p. 102). Lamarck (1816, p. 224) established the generic name *Tubifex* for two species, including *Tubifex rivulorum* Lamarck, 1816 (p. 225) which was introduced by him as a replacement name for *Lumbricus tubifex* Müller, 1774 (p. 27) (referring to Müller, 1776), apparently to avoid the tautology of '*Tubifex tubifex'*. *Tubifex rivulorum* was referred to as the 'type species of the genus' by Beddard (1895, p. 243), but in subsequent literature the type species of *Tubifex* is often quoted as '*Lumbricus tubifex* Müller, 1774' (e.g. Reynolds & Cook, 1976) or '*Tubifex tubifex* (Müller, 1774)' (e.g. Chekanovskaya, 1962; Brinkhurst, 1963, 1971b; Holmquist, 1985).

2. Early vernacular names based on Müller's *Nais* were used by Bosc (1802, p. 31), who separated the worms later known as oligochaetes into 'Naïade' and 'Lombric', and by Cuvier (1817, pp. 528–530), who treated 'Naïdes' as a group within 'Les Lombrics'. However, it was Ehrenberg (1828) who first established a family-group name (NAIDINA) that is a 'latinized noun in the nominative plural form from the stem of an available generic name' (Article 11.7.1 of the Code). This is sufficient for considering Ehrenberg as the author of what later was to become the family NAIDIDAE. The latter form of the name was first used by Vejdovský (1876), although he did not explicitly refer to Ehrenberg's NAIDINA. Grube (1851, p. 101), on the other hand, called it 'Familie NAIDEA Ehrenb.'.

3. Later, Vejdovský (1884) introduced a new taxon name, (family) NAIDOMORPHA, to replace NAIDINA Ehrenberg as well as his own NAIDIDAE; he also gave references to other vernacular and latinized family-group names stemming from the generic name *Nais* that had been published earlier by various authors ('Naïdes part. Oersted' [=1842]; 'NAIDEA part. Grube' [=1851]; 'NAICIDAE part. d'Udekem' [=1855]; 'Naides part. Johnston' [= 1865]). Thus, a posteriori he referred to his own NAIDIDAE as the same taxon as Ehrenberg's NAIDINA. For some time thereafter, the two names NAIDOMORPHA and NAIDIDAE were variably used by different authors, for largely the same group of oligochaetes. For instance, Benham (1890) and Michaelsen (1900) used NAIDIDAE, while others (e.g. Stieren, 1892; Beddard, 1895) preferred NAIDOMORPHA.

4. Vernacular names based on Lamarck's *Tubifex* were mentioned by d'Udekem (1855, pp. 541–548: 'Famille des Tubifex'; 1859, pp. 9–17: 'Famille des Tubifécidées').

5. Vejdovský (1876) established the latinized family name TUBIFICIDAE in the same publication as the one introducing NAIDIDAE. It was not clearly stated, but it is evident that he based his name on the genus *Tubifex*. In 1884, Vejdovský retained TUBIFICIDAE while he replaced NAIDIDAE by NAIDOMORPHA (see above), and TUBIFICIDAE has been in common use since then (e.g. Beddard, 1895; Michaelsen, 1900; and onwards).

6. NAIDIDAE has been regarded as a clitellate taxon with ancestral traits by some authors (e.g. Chekanovskaya, 1962; Omodeo, 1998), while others (e.g. Beddard, 1895; Stephenson, 1930; Brinkhurst, 1971a, 1982, 1994, 1999; Timm, 1981) have considered it as closely related to TUBIFICIDAE. However, regardless of its phylogenetic position, until recently NAIDIDAE has largely been regarded as a taxon separate from TUBIFICIDAE. One exception is Vaillant (1890), who treated TUBIFICINEA and NAIDINEA as two groups within the family NAIDIDAE.

7. Chekanovskaya (1962) proposed NAIDOMORPHA to be regarded as a taxon at the rank of an order, within which she recognized six different families, including NAIDIDAE and TUBIFICIDAE. This usage of NAIDOMORPHA sensu lato has been retained in some of the modern oligochaete literature (e.g. Kasprzak, 1984) but otherwise has not been widely accepted.

8. Throughout the 20th century, authorships of NAIDIDAE and TUBIFICIDAE were seldom mentioned in taxonomic publications, but Hrabě (1981) erroneously referred to them as NAIDIDAE Benham, 1890 and TUBIFICIDAE Vejdovský, 1884. Thus, the association of NAIDIDAE with Ehrenberg (1828) was largely unnoticed since the late 1800s, while Holmquist (1983) and Erséus et al. (2002) correctly indicated Vejdovský (1876) as the author of TUBIFICIDAE. Moreover, a subfamily name formed from the

stem of *Tubifex* was quoted as 'TUBIFICINAE Eisen, 1879', by Brinkhurst (1971b), and Holmquist (1983), and as 'TUBIFICINAE Eisen, 1885', by Hrabě (1981). However, although Eisen (1879) indeed was the first to define TUBIFICINI [sic] as a subfamily of TUBIFICIDAE, Vejdovský (1876) is the author of all family-group names based on *Tubifex* (Article 36.1 of the Code).

9. For over 100 years, NAIDIDAE and TUBIFICIDAE have consistently been regarded as two distinctly different groups of aquatic oligochaetes, a separation reflecting differences in morphology, behaviour and reproductive biology. The worms known as tubificids are common and often dominant infaunal elements (i.e. they are either burrowing or interstitial) in freshwater and marine sediments; and to date about 800 species have been described worldwide. They are well known not only to hydrobiologists but also to laymen, partly due to the use of tubificids ('Tubifex worms', or 'sludge worms') as pet fish food. Species of Tubifex and some other tubificids may occur in astonishingly high densities at organically polluted freshwater sites. Moreover, tubificids can attain a considerable size, e.g. Branchiura sowerbyi Beddard, 1892 may be up to 185 mm, Tubifex tubifex and Limnodrilus grandisetosus Nomura, 1932 up to 100 mm long (Chekanovskaya, 1962). A vast majority of tubificids reproduce sexually. The about 175 species hitherto regarded as NAIDIDAE, on the other hand, are characterized by traits deviating from those of most other aquatic oligochaetous clitellates. They are highly active animals, with an epibenthic or epiphytic lifestyle in freshwater or brackish water; some are capable of swimming, and some prey upon other microscopic invertebrates. Reproduction is predominantly asexual (by paratomic fission), and naidid specimens are often observed as chains of zooids; individuals with developed sexual organs are rare. The members of this group are on average smaller than the typical TUBIFICIDAE. A chain of individuals of some Chaetogaster spp. may be less than 1 mm long, and only rarely naidid chains are longer than 20 mm (Chekanovskaya, 1962). Thus, the name TUBIFICIDAE has been used to denote a worm group that is more conspicuous than, and at least four times as species-rich, as the group hitherto defined as NAIDIDAE.

10. Various morphological and molecular data now support that NAIDIDAE has evolved within the group earlier defined as TUBIFICIDAE (Brinkhurst, 1994; Christensen & Theisen, 1998; Erséus, 1990; Erséus et al., 2000, 2002), implying that these two families should be considered as synonyms. Erséus & Gustavsson (2002) recently suggested that treating the former NAIDIDAE as a subfamily (NAIDINAE) within TUBIFICIDAE would best promote stability in the classification of these clitellate worms. By such an action, all species formerly recognized as TUBIFICIDAE would still be classified as such, and all species formerly known as NAIDIDAE would still be attributed to a taxon, the name of which is based on the stem of *Nais*, albeit at a lower rank. However, as the family-group name NAIDIDAE is older than the family-group name TUBIFICIDAE, the Principle of Priority stipulates that all former members of TUBIFICIDAE should rather be regarded as part of NAIDIDAE. This means that a great majority of the species of the former TUBIFICIDAE would lose their association with a family-group name based on *Tubifex*, and only the about 200 members of the taxon at present defined as the subfamily TUBIFICINAE would retain this association. That is, about 600 species (comprising the current tubificid subfamilies TELMATODRILINAE Eisen, 1879, RHYACODRILINAE Hrabě, 1963, PHALLODRILINAE Brinkhurst, 1971b, and

LIMNODRILOIDINAE Erséus, 1982; see Erséus, 1990) would become subordinates of NAIDIDAE.

11. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to use its plenary power to rule that the family-group name TUBIFICIDAE Vejdovský, 1876 and other family-group names based on *Tubifex* Lamarck, 1816 are to be given precedence over NAIDIDAE Ehrenberg, 1828 and other family-group names based on *Nais* Müller, 1774, whenever their type genera are placed in the same family-group taxon;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the following names:
 (a) *Tubifex* Lamarck, 1816 (gender: masculine), type species by subsequent designation by Beddard (1895) *Lumbricus tubifex* Müller, 1774 (senior objective synonym of *Tubifex rivulorum* Lamarck, 1816);
 - (b) Nais Müller, 1774 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Sperber (1948) Nais barbata Müller, 1774;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:
 - (a) tubifex Müller, 1774, as published in the binomen Lumbricus tubifex (specific name of the type species of Tubifex Lamarck, 1816);
 - (b) *barbata* Müller, 1774, as published in the binomen *Nais barbata* (specific name of the type species of *Nais* Müller, 1774);
- (4) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology the following names:
 - (a) TUBIFICIDAE Vejdovský, 1876 (type genus *Tubifex* Lamarck, 1816), with the endorsement that it and other family-group names based on *Tubifex* are to be given precedence over NAIDIDAE Ehrenberg, 1828 and other family-group names based on *Nais* Müller, 1774 whenever their type genera are placed in the same family-group taxon;
 - (b) NAIDIDAE Ehrenberg, 1828 (type genus *Nais* Müller, 1774), with the endorsement that it and other family-group names based on *Nais* are not to be given priority over TUBIFICIDAE Vejdovský, 1876 and other family-group names based on *Tubifex* Lamarck, 1816 whenever their type genera are placed in the same family-group taxon.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Dr Philippe Bouchet for technical advice regarding the establishment of the authorship of NAIDIDAE, and to Dr Tarmo Timm for assistance with some literature in Russian, and for valuable comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council (621–2001–2788 to Christer Erséus).

References

Beddard, F.E. 1895. A monograph of the order of Oligochaeta. 769 pp. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
Benham, W.B. 1890. An attempt to classify earthworms. *Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science (New Series)*, 31: 201–315.

Bose, L.A.G. 1802. Histoire naturelle des vers, contenant leur description et leurs moeurs; avec figures dessinées d'après nature. Vol. 1: 1–300. In Buffon, G.L.L.D. & Castel, R.-R. (Eds.), Histoire naturelle de Buffon: classée par ordres, genres et espèces, d'après le systeme de Linné. Deterville, Paris.

- Brinkhurst, R.O. 1963. Taxonomical studies on the Tubificidae (Annelida, Oligochaeta). Internationale Revue der gesamten Hydrobiologie, Systematische Beihefte, 2: 1–89.
- Brinkhurst, R.O. 1971a. Phylogeny and classification. Part 1. Pp. 165–177 in Brinkhurst, R.O. & Jamieson, B.G.M. (Eds.), Aquatic Oligochaeta of the world. 860 pp. Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh.
- Brinkhurst, R.O. 1971b. Family Tubificidae. Pp. 444–625 in Brinkhurst, R.O. & Jamieson, B.G.M. (Eds.), Aquatic Oligochaeta of the world. 860 pp. Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh.
- Brinkhurst, R.O. 1982. Evolution in the Annelida. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 60: 1043–1059.
- Brinkhurst, R.O. 1994. Evolutionary relationships within the Clitellata: an update. *Megadrilogica*, **5**: 109–112.
- Brinkhurst, R.O. 1999. Retrospect and prospect: reflections on forty years of study of aquatic oligochaetes. *Hydrobiologia*, **406**: 9–19.
- Chekanovskaya, O.V. 1962. Vodnye maloshchetinkovye chervi fauny SSSR. 411 pp. Akademiya Nauk SSSR, Moskva-Leningrad. (In Russian).
- Christensen, B. & Theisen, B.F. 1998. Phylogenetic status of the family Naididae (Oligochaeta. Annelida) as inferred from DNA analyses. *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research*, **36**: 169–172.
- **Cuvier, G.** 1817. Le Règne Animal distribué d'après son organisation pour servir de base à l'histoire naturelle des animaux et d'introduction à l'anatomie comparée. Vol. 2: Les reptiles, les poissons, les mollusques et les annélides. 532 pp. Deterville, Paris.
- Ehrenberg, C.G. 1828. Symbolae physicae. Animalia evertebrata. 293 pp. Berlin.
- Eisen, G. 1879. Preliminary report on genera and species of Tubificidae. *Bihang till Kungliga Svenska Vetenskaps-akademiens Handlingar*, 5(16): 1–26.
- Eisen, G. 1885. Oligochaetological researches. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, 1883: 879–964.
- Erséus, C. 1982. Taxonomic revision of the marine genus *Limnodriloides* (Oligochaeta: Tubificidae). Verhandlungen des naturwissenschaftlichen Vereins in Hamburg (Neue Folge), 25: 207–277.
- Erséus, C. 1990. Cladistic analysis of the subfamilies within the Tubificidae. Zoologica Scripta, 19: 57–63.
- Erséus, C. & Gustavsson, L. 2002. A proposal to regard the former family Naididae as a subfamily within Tubificidae (Annelida, Clitellata). *Hydrobiologia*, **485**: 253–256.
- Erséus, C., Källersjö, M., Ekman, M. & Hovmöller, R. 2002. 18S rDNA phylogeny of the Tubificidae (Clitellata) and its constituent taxa: Dismissal of the Naididae. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 22: 414–422.
- Erséus, C., Prestegaard, T. & Källersjö, M. 2000. Phylogenetic analysis of Tubificidae (Annelida, Clitellata) based on 18S rDNA sequences. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 15: 381–389.
- Grube, A.E. 1851. Die Familien der Anneliden, mit Angabe ihrer Gattungen und Arten, Ein systematischer Versuch. 164 pp. Verlag der Nicholai'schen Buchhandlung, Berlin.
- Holmquist, C. 1983. What is *Tubifex tubifex* (O.F. Müller) (Oligochaeta, Tubificidae)? Zoologica Scripta, 12: 187–201.
- Holmquist, C. 1985. A revision of the genera *Tubifex* Lamarck, *Ilyodrilus* Eisen, and *Potamothrix* Vejdovský & Mrázek (Oligochaeta, Tubificidae), with extensions to some connected genera. *Zoologischer Jahrbücher, Abteihung für Systematik*, **112**: 311–366.
- Hrabě, S. 1963. On Rhyacodrilus lindbergi n. sp., a new cavernicolous species of the fam. Tubificidae (Oligochaeta) from Portugal. Boletim da Sociedade portuguesa de ciências naturais (Ser. 2), 10: 52–56.
- Hrabě, S. 1981. Vodní máloštětinatci (Oligochaeta) Československa. Acta Universitatis Carolinae—Biologica, 1979: 1–167.
- Johnston, G. 1865. A catalogue of the British non-parasitical worms in the collection of the British Museum. 365 pp. Taylor and Francis, London.
- Kasprzak, K. 1984. The previous and contemporary conceptions on phylogeny and systematic classifications of Oligochaeta (Annelida). *Annales zoologici, Warszawa*, **38**: 205–223.
- Lamarck, J.B. 1816. Histoire naturelle des animaux sans vertèbres. 3. 585 pp. Verdière, Paris.

- Michaelsen, W. 1900. Die Oligochaeten. Pp. 1–575 in Spengel, J. W. (Ed.), Das Tierreich, Vol. 10. Verlag von R. Friedländer und Sohn, Berlin.
- Müller, O.F. 1774. Vermium Terrestrium et Fluviatilium, seu Animalium Infusoriorum, Helminthicorum et Testaceorum, non Marinorum, Succincta Historia. Volume 1, Part 2. 72 pp. Heineck & Faber, Havniae & Lipsiae.
- Müller, O.F. 1776. Zoologiae Danicae. Prodromus, seu Animalium daniae et norvegiae indigenarum Characteres, Nomina, et Synonyma imprimis popularium. 32, 274 pp. Typis Hallageriis, Havniae.
- Oersted, A.S. 1842. Conspectus generum specierumque Naidum, ad faunam danicam pertinentium. Naturhistorisk Tidsskrift, Kjöbenhavn, 4: 128-140.
- Omodeo, P. 1998. History of Clitellata. Italian Journal of Zoology, 65: 51-73.
- Reynolds, J.W. & Cook, D.G. 1976. Nomenclatura Oligochaetologica. 217 pp. University of New Brunswick, Fredericton.
- Sperber, C. 1948. A taxonomical study of the Naididae. Zoologiska Bidrag från Uppsala, 28: 1–296.
- Stephenson, J. 1930. The Oligochaeta. 978 pp. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Stieren, A. 1892. Über einige Dero aus Trinidad, nebst Bemerkungen zur Systematik der Naidomorphen. Sitzungsberichte der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft, Dorpat, 10: 103–123.
- Timm, T. 1981. On the origin and evolution of aquatic Oligochaeta. *Eesti NSV Teaduste* Akadeemia Toimetised (Bioloogia), 30: 174–181.
- d'Udekem, J. 1855. Nouvelle classification des Annélides sétigères abranches. Bulletin de l'Academie r. de Belgique, Classe des sciences (ser. 8), 22(2): 533–555.
- d'Udekem, J. 1858. Nouvelle classification des Annélides sétigères abranches. Mémoires de l'Academie royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique, 31: 1–28.
- Vaillant, L. 1890. Histoire naturelle des Annélés marins et d'eau douce. Vol. 3, part 1. 340 pp. Paris.
- Vejdovský, F. 1876. Beiträge zur Oligochaetenfauna Böhmens. Sitzungsberichte der k. Böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Prag, 1875: 191–201.
- Vejdovský, F. 1884. System und Morphologie der Oligochaeten. 166 pp. Commissionsbuchhandlung von Franz Řivnač, Prague.

Acknowledgement of receipt of this application was published in BZN 61: 2.

Comments on this case are invited for publication (subject to editing) in the *Bulletin*; they should be sent to the Executive Secretary, I.C.Z.N., Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: iczn@nhm.ac.uk).